UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,696	09/12/2003	David D. Brandt	03AB014C/ALBRP303USC	7375
Susan M. Donahue Rockwell Automation, 704-P, IP Department 1201 South 2nd Street			EXAMINER	
			BAUM, RONALD	
Milwaukee, WI 53204			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2439	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/23/2010	PAPER

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/661,696	BRANDT ET AL.			
	Examiner	Art Unit			
	RONALD BAUM	2439			
All Participants:	Status of Application:				
(1) <u>RONALD BAUM</u> .	(3)				
(2) <u>BRIAN STEED</u> .	(4)				
Date of Interview: 10 March 2010	Time: <u>9:35am</u>				
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:					
Part I.					
Rejection(s) discussed: n/a					
Claims discussed: all					
Prior art documents discussed: n/a					
Part II.  SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  See Continuation Sheet					
Part III.					
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate of directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate of did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summar</li> </ul>	e examiner will provide a writter record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview			
/Edan Orgad/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2439					
(A	applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)			

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The amending of claims 1,7,12,15-17,25,26,30-34,36,38-41,49 and 50, and previous/associated interview/discussions with the applicant's representative - Brian Steed - to address the issues involved with the claim elements rejected in the last office action (12/21/2009), has failed to ascertain patently distinct material to amend the claims (via examiner amendment). The applicant's invention, as claimed, still essentially comprises a security management system with associated acquisition, storage, analysis/scanning and results reconfiguration/assets management, as applied to at least, a factory/automation environment, utilizing at least standard processing network devices (e.g. PLC's, PC's, etc.,). Discussed proposed potential amendments dealing with specific elements (i.e., the invention environment, protocols, network hardware elements, conformance issues, etc.,) failed to patently distinguish the claims - insofar as overcoming a potential USC 103' obviousness rejection - at least, dealing with the obviousness of the proposed specific elements as an (obvious) intended use (e.g., PLC with I/O modules - a factory automation environment - as obvious intended use of PC's with standard peripherals on a network). Therefore, the examiner declines to reopen prosecution. Thus, any such claims submitted formally after final rejection would not be entered.